

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 24, 33-35, and 39-41 are pending in this application. Claims 22, 23, 25-32, and 36-38 are canceled by the present response without prejudice and new claims 39-41 are added for examination. Those new claims are believed to be fully supported by the original specification, see for example page 23, lines 7-20. Claims 23, 24, 30, and 33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by WO 99/41876 to Bjorndahl. Claims 22, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 36, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bjorndahl in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2004/0209598 to Beamish et al. (herein "Beamish"). Claims 27 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bjorndahl combined with Beamish further in view of EP 0 856 812 to Beach. Claims 31 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Bjorndahl in view of Beach.

Addressing the above-noted prior art rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response as discussed next.

As noted above claims 22, 23, 25-32, and 36-38 are canceled by the present response without prejudice, and thus the rejections to those claims are obviated by the present response.

Of the currently pending claims, claims 24 and 33 are independent claims, and those claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Bjorndahl. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that claims 24 and 33 as written distinguish over Bjorndahl.

First, applicants note each of independent claims 24 and 33 is directed to an apparatus that can establish a **Bluetooth connection** with a handheld communication terminal and exchange information with the handheld communication terminal. In independent claims 24 and 33, instead of executing a procedure of a Bluetooth terminal search phase to acquire

terminal identification information, terminal identification information is “transmitted from a *wireless tag*” (emphasis added). Such features are believed to clearly distinguish over Bjorndahl.

First, applicants note Bjorndahl does not even disclose or suggest a device that can establish a Bluetooth connection with a handheld communication terminal and to exchange information with the handheld communication terminal. With respect to that feature the outstanding Office Action cites units 20 and 21 in Bjorndahl. Unit 20 in Bjorndahl is a dual mode mobile station and unit 21 is a dual mode private base station. In Bjorndahl the mobile station 20 can communication with the private base station 21 via an RF transmission that has a range of hundreds of meters, or via a more limited “cordless” mode having a much shorter range.¹

However, in neither of those instances does Bjorndahl disclose or suggest the dual mode mobile station 20 communicating with the dual mode private base station 21 via a Bluetooth connection. Thereby, Bjorndahl does not disclose that claimed feature.

Moreover, applicants submit Bjorndahl does not disclose or suggest acquiring terminal identification information of the handheld communication device “which is transmitted from a *wireless tag*” (emphasis added).

As discussed in the present specification for example at page 22, line 15 to page 23, line 20, in the claimed invention a wireless tag can be utilized for transmission of terminal identification information, rather than utilizing a conventional Bluetooth terminal search phase. Such an operation in the claimed invention of utilizing a wireless tag can be advantageous to acquire terminal information of the handheld communication terminal with respect to processing speed, cost, and communication distance. Bjorndahl does not disclose or suggest any such features.

¹ Bjorndahl at page 6, second paragraph.

With respect to the above-noted feature of transmitting terminal identification information “from a wireless tag”, the outstanding rejection cites unit 23 of Bjorndahl.² Applicants traverse that basis for the rejection.

Element 23 in Bjorndahl is an infrared (IR) signal emitter that can transmit IR signals. In that respect Bjorndahl discloses transmitting a cryptographic key using an infrared (IR) link. Bjorndahl does not disclose or suggest a wireless tag as recited in claims 24 and 33.

Further, as discussed in the present specification for example at page 23, lines 7-20, such a wireless tag can take different forms, now reflected for example in new dependent claims 39-41. The wireless tag may be a “passive wireless tag that does not require a battery” (claim 39), the wireless tag may be a “write once/read many (WORM) wireless tag” (claim 40), or the wireless tag may “employ LF-MF bandwidth” (claim 41). Such wireless tags as recited in new dependent claims 39-41 even further distinguish over the applied art, and particularly clearly differ from the IR signal emitter 23 in Bjorndahl.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit each of independent claims 24 and 33, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over Bjorndahl.

Moreover, no teachings in the further cited references to Beamish or Beach were cited with respect to the above-noted features, and no teachings in Beamish or Beach are believed to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Bjorndahl.

² Office Action of February 8, 2007, see the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4.

In view of the present response applicants respectfully submit the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.


Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 06/04)



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar
Registration No. 34,423

EHK:SNS\dt

I:\ATTY\SNS\21's\213133\213133US-AM.DOC